

M1049
Wednesday, September 28, 1966
New York City
Group III

Mr. Nyland: So, now, what do we talk about tonight. Who will tie the bell on the cat.

Ah, brave.

Questioner: Uh, at the end of the book All and Everything, Gurdjieff made a statement which, if I remember correctly, it went something like, "If Man would remember that he must die eventually, this would have somehow repercussions and great meaning for his life while on Earth." Would you explain that more definitively.

Mr. Nyland: Well, you know what All and Everything is written for?

Questioner: Not really.

Mr. Nyland: Did you only look at the end?

Questioner: No, I read the whole thing.

Mr. Nyland: You read the whole thing? And you have no idea what Gurdjieff means or why does he say it?

Questioner: Well, I have an idea but I would like clarity...

Mr. Nyland: No, tell me the idea. What do you think it means?

Questioner: Well, that going through what is our existence here is for a certain amount of time, and while we are here we must try to use this time as valuably as possible, because eventually this time here will diminish, and that whatever happens after will depend on the use that we put to it during the time we are here.

Mr. Nyland: Do you think something will happen afterwards?

Questioner: Well, I don't know. Maybe.

Mr. Nyland: No, one doesn't know; it may be yes, may be no, huh? But do you think that is

what Gurdjieff had in mind when he wrote the book?

Questioner: I think he had a great many, many things in mind, none of which I would try to label definitively as he had this in mind...

Mr. Nyland: Oh, I would like to, because he also makes a statement and we would like now to link it up. Because he makes that statement about death, he must have had in mind something, that he wanted people, to remind of the possibility that they might die. Well, why did he do that? Why did he think it was necessary to remind people? You see, there must be to some extent explained in the book; otherwise... It is not a statement just by itself. And he does make a few other remarks—if you read it and you remember, Ashiata Shiemash: about Love, Hope, and Charity, that for some reason that he felt that those are not sufficient and that the only way for people to be saved would be to remind them of their death. Now, if he did use the word ‘saved,’ which I think he did—that is, the solution for their lives—why do you think it was necessary to emphasize the necessity of being saved? But saved, in any event there is the possibility for Man to extricate himself out of the conditions in which he was, and that would be helped if he could consider the fact that he would die.

Of course it is obvious, you know, that as far as life is concerned, everybody dies, so a statement like that would be quite trite unless it had a definite meaning to remind people that they would die, and you can say, “You’re going to die before you know, time is short so you better hurry up, you better do something.” Well, what is the question then: What to do. And I think it is quite legitimate to ask, what does Gurdjieff want us to do. So it must be linked up with that.

When time is getting short I think of my death; I may die tomorrow, I may die in the next five years, who knows, maybe I’ll live forever; whatever it is, I have to think about that what is your death for a very definite reason. Could it be linked up with something that he thought Mankind has forgotten and if by thinking about their death they might be reminded? And what would be the reminder? To say it very simple: You have a task; and it is to remind them of the task they have, to remind them to wake up their Conscience, that something must be done. And what’s to be done is simply not because they live their lives, because that becomes already automatic; because they have been born without even their wish, and they find themselves right on Earth and they live their lives and there goes time and after a little while they die, and then what? Even if you believe in something that must continue to exist after their death, even then

one would ask, what's the purpose?

So really the question is, is there a definite meaning for every person's life? And that if I am reminded of my death, that means that in the ordinary terminology that my physical body dies, that perhaps during this particular time I happen to remember that I ought to do something while I am still alive. Otherwise, death might overtake me, and I cannot do it; the assumption is that I will not be able to be in the same kind of position as during my lifetime on Earth to be able to do certain things, leave alone the question what might happen after death even if I remain in existence.

And to say it very simple ... because if you read the book—which I doubt now a little bit—Gurdjieff talks about 'Partkdolg Duty.' And that we translate, as you know, 'Work on oneself,' so that what represents 'doing' is that one does that kind of Work; and quite definitely all throughout the book it is linked up with trying to become Objective. Because even in the title it says an Objective, Impartial criticism of the life of Man, to destroy mercilessly that what he is at the present time assuming so that then he might be able to understand what really could take its place. And that in the Second Series he indicates that there are certain people which he calls 'remarkable' who were, apparently, accomplished; something in their lives which would be, from the standpoint of Gurdjieff, worthwhile. And that in the Third Series, which would follow if it were ever published, that people then would know "life is only real as I am," which is the title; and that in that is given a certain number of tasks or exercises or concepts which a person could use in an application to their lives in order to become for themselves Conscious, or at least to have the possibility of remaining and becoming more and more Impartial.

So I think that death, the fact that I will die has to do with, "You better hurry up and do something." When he says that and he feels that something has to be done, he also knows that that must be an obligation and that the reminder of dying might cause people really to talk to their Conscience so that they then remember that they have a task to fulfill, and in the sense, as the book indicates, in the sense of Work. So there is no difficulty about the reason why he uses that and connects it, because the whole book is based on it.

All right?

Questioner: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: Yea.

New Questioner: Ah, is there any relationship between the wish to Work and the energy needed

to Work, when one actually begins to try to Awaken?

Mr. Nyland: What came first?

Questioner: Well, it seemed like first is the wish.

Mr. Nyland: And then when there's no energy.

Questioner: When there's no energy, then one can't Work.

Mr. Nyland: So, there's your relationship.

Questioner: So, is there a difference? I mean, I don't understand.

Mr. Nyland: But... There is of course that kind of a relation if you use those two words, like a 'wish' and 'energy.' If you want to define them now and to see in how far they might overlap, I think I have to have some energy in order to have a wish. And the wish has to be for something, and if that something is at the present time not existing and I would like to get it, either I hope that it will be given to me or that I can Work for it. Now, if I hope that it will be given, perhaps I don't need much energy than only breathing, and in the meantime I hope I keep my wish so that at the time when it comes, that my wish will be fulfilled. Of course it's a little bit foolish, because if I just sit and wish, I could wish for the moon but I'll never get there.

So usually when I have a wish, it means it's very clear that what I want to do and I will try to go in that direction, that as soon as I start moving I need energy for it. Energy is a force. Energy expresses itself in a wish, and what the wish then might mean, if it is for an aim which is a little bit unattainable or difficult to get at or sometimes impossible, on that will depend how much energy there is available for me to Work in that direction.

I don't see the unclarity of it.

Questioner: Well, I guess I'm interested in the sense that ... of the use of *my* energy. For instance, it seems at times that I have the wish to Work, or the wish enters into my mind, but it doesn't seem ... it seems that even if I make an effort, at times that I don't Wake Up, even if I continue the effort, and I was wondering...

Mr. Nyland: Well, what conclusion can you draw from that? Either the wish isn't strong enough and there may not be enough energy, or that what you aim at is too difficult.

Questioner: Well, does the wish... Well, it seems like that I've read that the energy for Working on yourself increases the more one Works over a period of time.

Mr. Nyland: That's right if you know where to get it from.

Questioner: But at times also it seems that the wish diminishes. Does that also mean that the

energy that is within oneself from Working...

Mr. Nyland: Wish is only noticeable by means of energy available; otherwise I call it a 'holy' wish—that is, something that I simply happen to feel and I would like to have, but I don't do anything about it, and all I have energy for is to express the wish. I don't mean very much when I simply say, "Oh, I could do this and that" and I don't do anything about it. And I even wouldn't call it a 'wish'; you know, just a little word, that's all, you might say, either to fill up time or to keep myself quiet.

So, as soon as there is then the possibility that I see I could grow and my wish is to go in that direction, and if at the same time I think that in going in that direction I will accomplish something for me that I really wish for, of course then I have to have some energy to sustain that wish, and I hope that the wish will continue all the time and I hope there is enough energy available.

Now, usually whenever I have any kind of an energy in any kind of an aim, there is a time when I become exhausted, and the energy is lost because it is not something from a source which I know I could tap that supplies me all the time. Because there is a limit on the quantity of energy I have at any one particular moment; the same way with when I eat there's a quantity of energy in the food but after a little while it has been digested and it is no more, and unless I keep on eating, I don't get energy.

Now, the different source of energy in ordinary life of course are ordinary food and air and impressions. So there are the three possibilities of getting energy and out of which at a certain time I concoct a wish of wanting to Work. Now the wish of wanting to Work on myself does not mean that it is an extension of a continuation of my life the way it is with the three different centers really functioning. The wish to Work really means that that what I now realize I possess, or really what is me as a body or as a feeling center or as an intellectual or some kind of a mental function, that that for me is still potential. Otherwise I wouldn't have a wish to grow further. I might have a wish to develop each center to its highest point of development, but of course there is a limit. Any kind of a logical thinking will tell me that I've reached the limit physically as far as my height is concerned, that perhaps I might have a wish to develop the muscles of my body or to be in a better healthy state or to be able to do certain things that someone else does not do, or even to live on very little when someone else needs more, and in that way you might say 'train' my physical body. And the example, as you know, is a fakir; or, let's say, a 'wrestler,' a

Man who considers that what is most important to him is the functioning of his physical body.

As far as the emotions or the feeling center—as we call it, a ‘center,’ something that functions in the solar plexus—is concerned, that that, of course, has at the present time a function, and I know it when I say ‘I feel’ and I experience, as a result of this kind of a feeling, different feelings, a comparison of different ... let’s say what takes place in my solar plexus is a different rate of vibrations or any way I want to express it, but I can distinguish between different kinds of feelings. Take opposites like love and hate—jealous, you know, inspiration even, things of that kind—of course I call them ‘feelings’ because I find myself with it.

Now, I could develop that; that is, I hope I could sharpen it, I could become more feeling, more sympathetic, more touched emotionally by certain things in the outside world which affect me and I, in feeling deeply I say I could ‘exercise’ my feeling center to its highest possible degree. I think there is also a limit to it, because even if I try to make myself feel more when I hear a fugue of Bach or a cantata in music, or I that see some kind of a sculpture or maybe some painting or whatever art there may be; or that I, in relation of myself towards what I call ‘God,’ have a religious feeling which deepens me, of course I can become so completely infatuated with that idea that I want to forget everything else in life and concentrate on this particular feeling. And then if I do it at the exclusion of everything else of myself and I then make it as deep as I can, and quite probably something that perhaps could satisfy me, I would ... I might call it an ‘emotion’; but it is something in which I then, in my devotion, yield completely and then I’m not interested primarily in my physical body and neither am I interested in my mind. And the example for that, of course, is a saint or a priest or a holy man or a monk. Again, this is a development of the feeling center up to its highest possible degree, but there is again a limitation.

And if you take your mind, I think it is even more limited than the rest; because if it is a question of filling it with data, certain facts, it’s obvious of course that there is a limit to the brain substance. It is enclosed in the skull and you can feed it and feed it and then it will start to flow over because there is no more room. Then one can see if I can digest it, then maybe there is more room for it, which of course is possible, but that ... what is digesting of a thought? It might mean activity, and it might also mean a certain form of feeling. But again, it is obvious that for myself there is a capacity that I can fill as far as my mental functions are concerned, and then there is something outside of that that I cannot fathom even with my mind, even when I try and when I concentrate on it, that perhaps I hope that in a long period of years that certain things will

become more intelligible to me or that I will get more understanding—and usually an understanding based on practicality as an application in life and that what I call ‘experience’—but I’m afraid that it is also limited in the end, that I say I “come to the end of my rope” as far as my mental functions are concerned.

So now the question of this kind of an aim, one has to settle it first, what kind it should be and for what particular purpose do I want to use my energy. Now if we talk in a Gurdjieffian sense, then the realization that there is a limit to my feeling center and a limit to my mind, simply indicates that there must be at the present time something that I call ‘potential’ which could develop if I only knew how to develop it; and that actually, of course, is that you know the theory that certain things in my emotional sphere I could develop belonging to a different kind of a world and what I then would call ‘Consciousness’ if that what I am now mentally is a state of unconsciousness.

Well, we don’t have to go into detail about that. The question is, where is the energy now coming from for that particular purpose. So if I find now that I want to Work and I have energy for that kind of an aim, then I find that also that energy runs dry and there is no other source where I can rely on. Neither is ordinary food or air or even impressions. That even with the best intentions in the world, that my wish also runs out and is not enough to feed even the energy that is available in the particular channel that would be necessary for a further development of those two other centers—that is, the feeling center and the intellectual one.

The question is this: How do I get my wish, and what amount of energy is represented by that kind of a wish. It may be that there is a stirring in me of a realization of that what I am and that what I then see and, provided I can see it as truthfully as I can, that that will create in me a desire to change it. I think the motivation has to be there; surely for a motivation when I want to Work when Work is rather difficult. You know? So depending on the depth of that wish or the depth of the realization of what I am and that what I consider a possible aim for myself, when there is a discrepancy between the two and I really wish to reach an aim, of something that I am not at the present time, I think my wish will have a little more energy and it will run a little longer. Still, if it is left by itself it will also come to an end, because apparently everything comes to an end on Earth. It depends entirely on what a personality is and how much there is available. Some people are weak and some are stronger, and it doesn’t matter at what particular degree of the ladder where you start, you’re all climbing to the top, and that’s the end of the

ladder.

I think you have to realize that first, that there is automatically an end to a wish. Now you ask how to feed it: by tapping a different source. Where is the source if it is not on Earth. It's got to be outside of Earth. What kind of material, or what kind of food can be kept, from something outside of the Earth? Well, I can assume that certain things of a higher quality exist around the Earth somewhere, and cosmologically speaking that they belong to an atmosphere of the planets or the solar system as itself or outside of that, whatever it may be and whatever terms you want to use for it. I surely can assume that there is energy available all over the totality of the 'universe,' if I want to use that term, and surely it is not limited to energies as now exist on Earth—you know, it is logical to assume it.

The question is then, if that energy is there, how can I get it? And can I pray for it, is one way; if I actually could tap that source to the point where I know who is in charge of it, perhaps such a person—if it is a person, if it is God of some kind or if it is His Endlessness—if he does recognize me, if my prayer is serious enough and he might give us something. Supposing he does? Am I capable of digesting it? It's a different form of energy, because it has to be energy of a higher form.

So, you see, there are three things to be fulfilled. One is the belief that something else exists outside, the second is that I know how to obtain it, and the third is that when I get it that I know what to do with it. So if there is any possibility of extracting energy from sources outside of myself, outside of Earth, I first must make sure that the energy of Earth, as far as it is available to me, I have exhausted. You see, it's very important to see that, because if I haven't done that yet, I'm not entitled to any other kind of energy.

So now I look at myself first and I discover that there is a great deal of energy that is being spent and I call it 'uselessly,' and if I really knew how much it was, I would be quite ashamed of being that kind of a bad manager about my own energy. And the loss of energy in any one of the three centers is really tremendous. Loss of energy with unnecessary muscular tensions, unnecessary facial expressions, unnecessary talk, to take those three; unnecessary movement perhaps—running around like a chicken without a head, and so forth. The second, feeling: unnecessary feeling in meddling into the affairs of someone where it is none of my concern; because I am not living their life and they are not living mine, but I surely—unless it would be highly necessary as a form of communication—I'm not entitled even to consider how they spend

their energy and get hot and cold because they are this and that and this and that. So, all kinds of criticisms that I have about people, about conditions, about certain things over which I have absolutely no control but as the saying goes, I 'lose myself' in them. And the third, that is the question of thoughts, the question of mental processes, the question of constantly repeating that what I already know, the thoughts that I have which are already past because they belong to an event which is now past which I keep on raking up and bringing back again to the foreground in order to have a nice lovely feeling about them, or because it was something where I was hurt and I will tell the story of how so-and-so stepped on my toes and what I did and what he did and then I did and how I felt and this and that, and I will tell it to everybody that I can get hold of and who is willing to listen. I think there is a tremendous amount of energy that is lost in ordinary mental processes which we simply allow without putting a stop to it.

So now when it's a question of conserving energy, I start with that first. Then maybe I have some extra, and maybe if then my wish is strong enough, it would marshal that kind of an energy in the direction where I really think it's going to be useful, or at least usefully spent. You understand? This is the next step, and it is important. Even at that, it's not enough, and I think that even with this extra energy, if it could be made available it also will run dry because it belongs to Earth, and Earth is not interested in the continuation of something existing. It happens to be that kind of a law, because whenever anything is in motion there is always friction, and gradually after some time, longer or shorter, the friction will kill the motion.

Therefore there has to be a supply of a different kind, and if it is available outside and I believe in it, I believe that I am entitled to it, then it's a question, how do I digest it? This means the building of something within me which at the present time is potential and could develop in that direction and then be the equipment with which such energy, when it is available around me, could be tapped—that is, a contact could be made—and that then at that time such energy could flow into me, I could then digest it in the proper way, and as a result it would give me energy for the purpose for which originally that kind of energy originally was given.

So if you talk about losing your wish, there are many ways to find out why you have lost it. When you finally know, then you can talk. But the logical conclusion is, when I haven't got the wish, I just haven't got the wish. I would almost say, "So what?" I have to make it.

Questioner: But the previous attempts at Working which resulted maybe in a little energy being I guess, converted for more Work would still be there regardless of the wish...

Mr. Nyland: No. Work requires energy. If you Work on yourself, you use energy for it. You think energy is inexhaustible? I have to have a pipeline to Infinity. You see, you haven't got it. That what I call this kind of a 'pipeline' would be a state of being Awake. And I know well enough I'm not Awake all the time. Very seldom even that I am Awake, and of course at such a moment there is a contact through which energy can flow as long as I'm Awake. As soon as I fall asleep again, then of course it is shut off. The requirement would be to be Awake all the time, and for that I need energy. So you see, it is like the chicken and the egg: If I had this it would be fine; if I have the other ... if I have the other, then I have the other. It's nice to have a ham sandwich if I have a piece of ham, provided I have some bread.

No, it starts very simply with the realization that I want to Work for whatever the reason is; and then I exhaust my wish and then I wait until I recuperate again a little bit of extra energy in the form of a wish, and again I Work, I spend then energy on the effort, when it is exhausted, I wait. I hope then that my natural life, based on my experiences and the way I think and the way I feel, will again supply me with the wish. And when the wish is there, I put it immediately into an attempt to practice. So each time that it happens that the wish is there, I try to Wake Up. When it is finished, it's finished; I wait and I go ahead.

Now if during that time I start to realize that the real wish for me can exist because of a real understanding of what I really am, then I think I have made a certain step forward. Because the constancy of the admission that I am not what I should be and that for me the possibility exists of becoming different and that I will not allow any particular kind of thoughts in the direction of smugness or satisfaction, cheapness or vanity, or all these things which take up energy, I will not allow them because I say they are not 'becoming' to a Man who wants to grow up, then out of that gradually I will have more and more of a wish.

The ultimate wish is based on the realization that Man is mechanical. If I once and for all knew this, and if I know it in my bones, I would always have a wish.

All right?

Questioner: It's not of, of becoming more perceptive about my own use of energy.

Mr. Nyland: It is a matter of Work. Every time you think, convert it. Every time you feel, convert it. Every time you are reminded, put it to a test to Wake Up with that. Make the effort whenever you think you can; keep on, have patience, and in time one little brick after another little brick will build a wall. It cannot be done overnight; the difficulty is that there are so many

obstacles that have been acquired and accumulated in one's life that it will take quite some time to undo them and I, with my tendencies and so-called my 'nature' and the way I have been brought up, the way I am built and whatever my type is, all of that, living on Earth for quite a number of years surely has instilled the impossibility of that kind of Work.

All right?

Questioner: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

New Questioner: You indicated that one of the ways of tapping this energy from outside the Earth is by praying to God. Are there any others?

Mr. Nyland: Well, it all depends what you understand by God. You see, if the concept of God is Omnipresence and Omniscience and Omnipotence, what else is there? There couldn't be, because if something else existed besides that, that would be God. You see, it's quite logical. Therefore I say, it all depends what you understand by it. The question is, can I in my ordinary life have a concept of God like that? Like sometimes it is said, 'His Endlessness,' or 'Infinity.' To the amount ... the degree that I can conceive of what is Infinity, to that amount I am not only entitled to it, but I will have it. If I could realize that at any one time that what is Omnipresent is now at this moment, all that would be required for me is to have a receiving apparatus that actually could receive that. That means that within me I have to have an understanding, and not just a knowledge but an understanding based on experience of Infinity. With that I could tap Infinity.

But partly it's a quibbling with words, you see, because that what I now consider as a source ... a certain source of energy, and I talk about the energy which is not of this Earth. There are any number of forms of energy of the Earth which of course sometimes I might call 'natural resources' and sometimes synthetic products—sometimes chemicals, sometimes inert chemicals, and sometimes a form of, let's say, 'impressions' which can reach me by means of my five sense organs. I think there are any number of forms of energy. As long as they are of Earth, they have a definite quality that belongs to it. In general I would say they remain subjective as long as they have anything to do with Earth.

There is a possibility of a mixture: partly Earth, partly, let's use the word 'spiritual.' I think there are many so-called 'mixed' emotions, which are partly devoted to a maintenance of one's life on Earth and partly devoted to a wish to be free from Earth. I don't think they are

entirely pure, but they have the possibility of something in them. I don't know the percentage—maybe 1 percent, maybe at times 50 percent, maybe 50/50—but in any event there is the possibility of such things existing, and that sometimes when they, as it were, 'enter' into me, that part of that what is more pure appeals to me and enters, or I see it or I could become Aware, and at other times it may be the dark part.

You know, it is very difficult to say what I extract from air. Do I extract a little nitrogen with the oxygen? Do I take all the oxygen out of air? Is no more oxygen in that what I exhale? Do I take in argon or krypton or xenon, any of those which I still call 'inert' gases and which, chemically speaking, have a tremendous amount of energy in them because they are closed and they have circles ... a certain circumference or at least different rings of electrons which represent forms of energy which apparently, when they are chemically inert as they are to a great extent, are not suitable for *my* chemistry.

Now, if I say *they* exist on Earth, I say they are mixed; and part of that what I now call, almost I would say, the 'holy' gases—that is, the intrinsic ones, they are rarified—belong to an atmosphere which is not the Earth but somehow or other, for some reason or other they happen to be on Earth, and I breathe them in. They are in very small quantity, and if I would like to extract something from it I would have to take in a hell of a lot of air and then probably build up a percentage of that rarified gas within me, it would be only one part of the problem. Because supposing it is there and it is there at the present time, what is there to extract it? My lungs? They only can take in oxygen; they throw even the nitrogen out for the feeding of blood, which apparently needs that form of oxygen in some way or other. There is a limit, of course, how much it can be fed. I cannot drink in—I call it now 'drinking'; it is like sucking in—ozone. It's a form of oxygen which has a little bit of a higher quality—if you know chemistry it's O₃ instead of O₂—so it is a little bit more rarified, but the oxidation that would take place is too much for my body and I would die from it.

So, you see, the balance of myself in taking in any kind of food from the outside world, I as a human man have to be adjusted to that since my body has to be adjusted to a very carefully calibrated equilibrium. Now, if I start to disturb it by the intake of different forms of food from different kinds of sources, the energy may be there but I may be sacrificed in the particular process. There is energy in the form of electricity. There is energy in the form of an atomic bomb. But can Mankind at the present time use the bomb, than only for destruction? There is

extreme difficulty to extract it and to control it, and that many processes which take place at the present time having to do with the splitting of the atom is really running ahead a little bit of the adjustment of Mother Nature and Organic Kingdom—that is, including Man—could make in time if it were fed to them in small doses so they could accomplish that what is now an accommodation, but at the present time is given in such quantities that Mankind cannot cope with it and it becomes a danger.

I think this is a logical result of undoing something, like *L'Apprenti sorcier*—you know, ‘the magician’s pupil.’ You remember... I do not know if you’re familiar with that kind of story. Paul Dukas wrote the music for it. It is where the pupil has learned a little bit about a possible magic formula, and it has to do with water and a tap for water, and he knows how to open it but he doesn’t know how to close it. So there he is and the water is coming and it’s fine in the beginning and gradually the water goes higher and higher and he is there, he doesn’t know how to close the faucet. And it comes up to his lips and he drowns, almost, and of course at that particular time the magician comes himself and saves him.

We have unloosed many things at the present time that is absolutely outside our control. In exactly the same way, if I try to find new sources of energy for myself which have to be digested, I think I have to be extremely careful because I don’t know enough about my body for any kind of a new form of energy that I could digest. If I am exposed too much to X-rays, which may be electrons in a certain form perhaps like a ray which is affecting me, of course I know that if I take it my stomach cannot take it and I throw up and I get sick. Now, it may be good for certain purposes, that if I take an X-ray in order to find out if my bone is broken it’s quite necessary, maybe; but I have to go through the difficulty of throwing out the extra electrons, and it goes at the cost of certain adjustments which my body has to make. And this is not only true of electrons and electricity in general, it’s true of any kind of a chemical. If I take too much of I don’t care what— at the present time there are so many chemicals, medicines, drugs and so forth on the market which you can take—if you take a little bit too much it may be quite wrong. You know, if there are ... some trouble and they give you penicillin, it kills probably what the trouble is, and then you are sick from the penicillin and it may take a little while.

The body is a fine instrument. It’s a beautiful instrument, and because it’s kept in such simple equilibrium it is something that one has to be very, very careful with. But we misuse it. We misuse... Take for instance such a delicate instrument as one’s eye, by having to drive a car

and constantly being exposed to the glaring headlights of other cars coming on, and then they are surprised that they have to wear glasses. People sometimes who are quite stupid to adapt, or try to adapt themselves to certain conditions simply because they like them. And if I like beer, pretty soon I'll have a stomach. And again, you will multiply many of these examples in your own experience, and you know it.

So I say, when there are different sources, there is no question; energy is all around, energy is everywhere. Energy always exists either in motion or even as potential, in place. As you know, physically speaking there are two kinds of energy, an energy of motion, kinetic energy— MV^2 —and energy of place. Like the law of gravity; it is energy; it can be changed over from one into the other. If something is resting on the table, it has energy of place; when I take the table away, it falls to the ground, it changes to energy of motion; until it gets to the ground, and again it changes to energy of place. And sometimes enough energy is produced to melt the particular object that happens to be falling if it comes from a great height. And things like that; I mean ordinary physics. So, it is very interesting to try to study where different energies for human beings could come from and that we in that respect surely have not uncovered all the sources, and not even knowing what to do with them when we do uncover them.

But you see, this kind of energy can only be used for that what is on Earth as Earth. It is not energy that is fine enough to be used for the building up of something that is rarified or that belongs to a different atmosphere or a different level of Being. And this is what we are talking about. I cannot use ordinary potatoes for the feeding of my spiritual well-being. I can use it if in me there is something of changing the starchiness of a potato into a quality kind of a product which could have a spiritual value.

You see, when I start to think about how should certain forms of energy be made available for the purposes I have in mind, of course I cannot help saying that certain energies are too crude and others are too light. And that if the law of real equilibrium has to be fulfilled, that then what has to be fed has to be fed by the form of energy available for that, and not energy of a higher quality to be used for a lower quality—and reversely, I have energy for a lower ... of a lower quality can never be used for a higher. You know, the degrees of sensitivity of that which is of finiteness, that what is a density difference, all of these things are related, and if I stay on the surface of Earth I can only digest that what belongs to Earth. If there is something in me like an apparatus that could digest certain densities as coming from heaven, then I could become an

angel.

You understand what I mean. It is not only a question of knowing that there are sources of energy. They are all around. As I said, it just doesn't mean energy all over now; but when I'm blind it is like a color black: I can't just see; in this way, I just cannot become Aware.

Yea.

New Questioner: Uh, in regard to the emotional center, the thing that I don't have clear in my mind is when a negative emotion ... or if there is a negative emotion or if it is just an emotion that becomes negative when imagination or identification becomes part of it, or is there such a thing as a negative emotion?

Mr. Nyland: Well, I think there are emotions above the line and below the line. Where exactly the line is, I don't know; I think that it is for a certain purpose that one cannot really define it; otherwise we wouldn't have any discussion about it. I think it's very necessary to know that different people have different ideas about their negativity. What is negative for me may not be for you, and reversely. But if I stay with myself as something that I experience, there are quite definitely what I would call 'negative' emotions or 'negative' feelings, particularly when they have the expression of, in general, like a hate or of jealousy or something that I determine as being negative. The negativity or positivity is very often defined by the culture in which I live, and what in general people consider as something I should not be, or whatever I experience as a feeling, then it is called 'negative.'

Sometimes negative feelings can produce the inability to act, and if acting is needed, then the negative emotion becomes, for *that* reason, negative. It is rather wide possibility of defining it, and usually since I don't know where the one goes over into the other. Because if I say "I'm jealous," it's negative; "Well, I'm just a little jealous," well, it's still negative; "I'm almost jealous," well, where am I now. Partly going over onto that, "I'm understandingly jealous"; you see, I already introduce something that takes away a little bit of that jealousy; it's still there, more or less colored, but there is understanding with it. "I am reasonably jealous," now I'm a little bit more positive because now I think that I'm justified to be jealous.

You see how difficult it is to define where it becomes positive. What I take in extremes, one will know that certain things quite definitely are downgrading or pulling me down, and the others I say are 'uplifting' and helping me to have aspirations or inspirations of some kind. And usually the question of positivity and negativity is determined if one is a good Man or a bad Man

if one forms concepts of 'good' or concepts of 'evil'; and that what in general is classified as 'negative' is when I pursue the direction of evil. And again, good and evil, it's a very flexible kind of a term because it depends on what I have been brought up with and what is at the present time right or wrong in this world. And that what is determined as right and wrong, sometimes politically or sociologically, it's prescribed in a book of law and it is then something to the interpretation of a judge or a policeman.

I do not know many times when it is right or wrong, but what I can say is, I am emotionally or feelingly involved, and there is something that takes place which is quite definitely different from that what I call a 'thought' or a 'mental' process, and also different from that what is my body. And it is the kind of a quality that is perhaps, if you compare it with density, is surely different when I consider it a feeling as compared to ordinary matter; and that feeling in that sense is very often linked up with a certain substance like air or gas instead of being connected with that what is solid or liquid.

Now, to what extent that can be useful for oneself, and the justification of having either a negative or a positive feeling or emotion, it depends entirely under what kind of control it is. Because if it just happens because I happen to feel, and I sometimes say "I can't help it but I feel jealous," and my mind says, "I shouldn't feel jealous," and my feeling center says, "Yes, but it continues," there is of course a little fight between the two. I say there is no control, and apparently I have to live until it's finished or until it has worked itself out.

Now, I can use all kinds of little ways of trying to avoid it and to try to avoid the effect of it. For instance, I feel feelingly, emotionally involved with someone and I hate this or that and I criticize them, but I have it and I sit and I realize that I am subject to that kind of a feeling. Now, I try maybe to do certain work of an ordinary kind physically. It takes up energy on my part and there is less energy available for feeding the feeling. In that way I diminish. Sometimes my reasoning powers are sufficient to take the energy if I keep on thinking about it instead of expressing it as feeling, and of course there are many more ways by which really one can tackle the particular problem of not allowing a feeling center to express itself into certain manifestations of the body.

And this applies to the negative quantity of energy of a certain intensity, and also of a positive one. The feeling of tremendous elation for something that may make me quite incapable of doing anything that is worthwhile, because constantly I happen to think about that what is so

marvelous and beautiful, and I don't want to take even the time by taking it away from that what is such a pleasurable feeling. I cannot do anything about it, because, as I say, there is *no one* who can control it.

I am absolutely in that sense a ship without a rudder, because I find myself with it and my mind is incapable of telling "Yes or no," or "stop it or start." If one discovers it as far as life is concerned in ordinary life, one simply says, "I'll do the best I can." And if I'm elated and the circumstances are such that I don't want to show it, I don't want to show it on my face, I'll keep it within. If I have a negative feeling and I don't want to make it known to someone else, I hold it within myself. When there is constantly the feeding, of my mind ought to make up the reason why I want to feel jealous or why I want to feel guilty, why I want to feel this or that, then maybe it leads at a certain time to an explosion because I can't stand it.

So in order to have different outlets, different safety valves, I try to use all the different possibilities of myself as a human being in order to give it a little outlet and release the pressure. You see, it is a simple kind of a solution. If I am bothered by that kind of feeling that it gets too much, I walk, maybe I run, maybe I do some heavy lifting, maybe I become interested in a book, maybe I become interested in thinking about something that has really nothing to do with the source of my emotional disturbance.

I say there are many different ways in ordinary life by which it can be met. It can be met if one could at such a time become a little bit more Objective to it, because that what is Objectivity would become Impartial to the state of my feeling. In that sense it would be helpful. But the trouble is when it is negative I hug it, I don't want to give it up. And this is something, that when I feel pleasant about a negativity, why should I give it up? One continues with it again until it is run out, or until one can see it as something that is a little foolish, and then one says, "Now accept it, stop it."

It is so in general, you see? Whatever one now can apply of it in one's particular case, that is another question. That is, if that kind of a principle can be adhered to, I would be able to use it for a better understanding of myself.

Huh? Three times you have that hand up, huh? Are you so anxious?

New Questioner: Yes. I wanted to know if there is any way of telling when you feel you have a negative emotion...

Mr. Nyland: Well, I said a little while ago...

Questioner: Wait. If you are suppressing it or if you are converting the energy that is...

Mr. Nyland: Oh, I think if you convert it, you know it. And suppressing it, you must know.

Because what do you suppress? Not the feeling. You suppress the expression. Use the example of a poker face: You have joy; it's a very good hand, much better than anyone else; pretty soon you will win the game, but if you give any kind of information on your face you are lost. So, you see, one cannot always express certain things even if you feel like it, and this applies to a negative or a positive one. But I surely know that I have to have a poker face, because my natural way would be to show it. So I know when I suppress something, and if I don't know it, I don't suppress it. It's very logical that way. It does not mean that the expression of it is always the same or can even be compared with the expression of someone else who might have the same kind of feeling. This is completely a personal affair. But I, for myself, know when there is pressure. Pressure is pressure. I have a means of knowing when there is pressure, same way as I have means of knowing when I have a stomach ache. You see, I don't think it is a problem. I don't think it bothers very much unless it has explosive properties or that you run wild or amok, or kill your grandmother.

You know, many of these things, when they come to extremes of course they become a little dangerous. And as I said a little while ago, that what I consider civilization under which I live and I have to adhere to the rules, that it is something that becomes dangerous to someone else then who calls for a policeman and probably put me in prison. So of course I don't want to do that when I want to remain a reasonable Man in a profession where I want to command the respect from the people who buy from me. But for ordinary fellows, you know, I feel and I'm a little upset; I feel a little pressure here and there and would like to say it; sometimes I let off steam if there's a possibility for it. Why don't I swear a little more when it is necessary. Surely I swear at times to let off steam. When I'm very much in an enjoyable state, I can't help communicate it to someone else. That my thoughts are wildly running around and I show them my face and someone asks, "What's the matter with you, are you worried?"

You know, these things are really so often ordinary occurrences, and one copes with it in ordinary life; one knows what to do with it; if it's a little too much pressure, you let it out; if there's too much blood pressure, you know, you poke your arteries and get some blood. It is so simple. Psychologically, if there is a little bit too much, you know you shouldn't feed it if you can, and perhaps you should relax it, or you should divert the energy into another channel. And

no more is necessary for ordinary affairs. If it is something that touches you deeply, like the dying of someone who is a dear friend of yours, you will have a terrible time, of course, making adjustment; and logically, because it is that kind of an affair and it is that kind of a so-called 'impression' and experience that I have to digest, like it or not.

If you have in mind how to use it in the best way possible, that is an entirely different question, because that question does not only apply to a certain over-amount of emotional energy. That depends entirely on what I said a little while ago, my wish to do something about my life; and again, that depends on how I consider my life, and as long as there are certain things that I cannot cope with in my life, I may be driven in the direction of wanting to do something quite definitely in order to alleviate the state in which I am. If that is that kind of pressure as a result of thought or a result of real feeling, or something that engages me and in which I am involved, then it is a different kind of question because it is not so easily diverted because it occurs all the time; I go to bed with it, I wake up with it if it is a real worry: I have to spend a thousand dollars and I haven't got it and here the taxes are out and if I don't pay it then someone is coming to pick me up. Whatever it may be. If I've said something and it's misunderstood and if I value the relationship, I will almost break heaven and earth in order to try to explain it, and I will run after such a person even if they've gone to Tibet.

You see, this kind of problems when they do happen in life—and every once in a while they must happen; accidentally, maybe—of course if I see it coming, I run away from it because I don't want to have that kind of experience. But I cannot run away from an avalanche sometimes, and it happens to be ... if I happen to be in the midst of a thunderstorm I take all kind of protection and I don't wear some metal; even if it is a cross, I would hide it because it might affect the lightening. I think in many ways a person is very clever in order to avoid all the dire influences to which he must necessarily be subject, and particularly when he has experienced them already; and this we call in general 'maturity,' or knowledge of people; knowledgeable Man, a Man who is partly, let's say, 'Man of the world,' the world of his living or the world of his profession. But, you know, whenever that happens I have my own formula of evading them, or if I have solved them I have no more fear for them.

All these questions, all this so-called 'this-and-that' and the state in which I am, I think it's very much exaggerated. I think it is usually because I happen to think about it that I also connect it in application with the fact that I *ought* to feel it. And many times I'm quite sure I don't really

feel it, but it seems to be customary that I ought to, otherwise I am not belonging to a general group of people I call my 'friends.'

If you have definite problems—that there are certain things or if you have a definite aim that you want to use any form of energy which you have and which might be available for a certain purpose—the only way is to try to get away from Earth. That would solve all problems, and that simply is another way of saying, "Try to become free." And if you want to define what it is I want to be free from, I say, "Yes, that what binds me." And what binds me? That what makes me reacting as a creature. That is the binding. That is the way the little Lilliputians have bound Gulliver to the Earth; and there are many, many strings, and it may take a long time before they all can be cut because there are many facets of a human being that create for him human bondage.

So if it is a question of freedom, then I have to start tackling that which is now bondage A and bond B and bond C until the bitter end. But then I have an aim; and then there might be a possibility of the utilization of a form of energy for that particular purpose; and all I then will have to do is to find out how to use it—and then the necessity, of course, of using it in the right direction with all my force, with all my wish, with all my heart, with all my desire. Then I say there is something worthwhile fighting for. If it's a matter that stays on Earth, it is only a shifting of scenery; it doesn't matter at what particular point I'm unconscious, as long as I remain unconscious it's still unconscious; I don't care in what particular place: I'm unhappy in New York and I am unhappy in Philadelphia and San Francisco. It doesn't make any difference, because *I* am unhappy. As soon as I know it is not necessarily the conditions although it may provoke me in some way then after a little while I realize it's my own state and that the state stays with me, it's enough proof to know that something in me perhaps is wrong. And perhaps I could change it, perhaps with a change of conditions where the change is temporarily; but if it is something that is like a disease—like a disease of tomorrow, like a disease of wanting to be lazy, of not wanting to make any kind of an effort, of expecting praise from people, you know, and there are many, many different vices and virtues of a Man—all of that without any question binds him to Earth.

Now, enough said about that particular question?

Yea.

New Questioner: I'd like to know how a Man can start to realize how mechanical he is.

Mr. Nyland: I don't know. I think the easiest way is to see what other people are doing and how mechanical they are. It's easier because I usually ... it's none of my business but I like to make it my business, and when I see it I like to indulge in criticism and I will say, "Look, how stupid. Look, look, he didn't even know what he was talking about." I think I would accumulate many data about my friends and enemies, particularly when I'm interested in the subject of mechanicality, to see that they are acting like a machine. I said a little while ago, a chicken without a head; it's worse then, but sometimes they act like computers; sometimes they are so-called 'intellectuals'; and sometimes they are so tremendously glib—by a desire for argument—that surely they are so mechanical and not know even when to stop if the mechanicality is expressed in momentum.

Try to understand what momentum is. It's a certain movement in a certain direction which sometimes is under ... not under control; the mechanicality is like to break something and that automatically it flows. Mechanicality and automatism are very ... almost the same kind of a word, the same kind of a concept. But when I see it in other people and then maybe I say, "Thank you, by the grace of God I would be going there," I think I would start to try to believe that for a little while; I would say, "Look at him; how mechanical! Thank God I'm not like that." I think, of course, it's a foolish statement, but it satisfies me for a little while because I don't have to do anything about it.

It is much cheaper to remain critical about someone else. At the same time, I start at moments to question exactly that kind of a statement, because there is one thing—a little bit of Conscience—which comes in and says, "What gives me a right to say that of someone else." And if I'm not too vain, too much in love with myself, I will say, "What would *I* have done?" Then, of course, I transfer, now, the object of my observation a little bit to myself, and I start now to compare myself with the behavior of other people and my own behavior—the way I know how I know I would do—and although in the beginning you will say, "If I were in his place, of course I wouldn't have done it this way or that way," there is a point at which one says, "If I were in his place, I would be like him, I would have done exactly the same thing."

Then, I say, one is at the point where one can cross over into something that has to do with oneself. Because then the thought comes, "Why is a person behaving that way which I call mechanical"; you see, his makeup, the way he was brought up, the way it is as his type. If I now look at it as all human beings having a certain body and mind and a feeling and functioning on

Earth in a certain way, and practically all in the same kind of a thing in the same kind of a way; that the differences may be as type, nevertheless they are human, and that they are human qualities which are quite definitely alike. We all sleep, we all play, we all have sex, all the different things that appear in some form or other, I think it makes us more or less brothers and sisters.

Now, if I say that someone else is mechanical and why is he and I can explain it, I think if I am interested in myself it won't take long before I start, "Am I mechanical?" Can I explain why I have done this and that? And if that is the case, I say I've 'crossed over' into a different kind of field, because then I become of interest to myself. And when that is there, then it becomes a little more fascinating and probably intriguing, and after some time it is adventure so that I would like to find out a little bit more. When I say, "Now, all right; someone makes a statement all people are mechanical; am I, all the time; let me find out," then at the end of the day I go over my day and I see to what extent have I been really what I would call 'mechanical,' and to what extent have I followed something that I still say is my 'will,' or that what I intended to do and insisted on doing.

So now if I have a little division I would say "Yes, I am sixty percent mechanical, forty percent I am still my own voice." Well, perhaps that kind of a statement I start to question also. Where does my will come from, and what is there in me that repeats itself in the same way? Now, I say I'm kindhearted and therefore I treat my wife the way I do; at the same time if I didn't I know she would fly off the handle; so maybe I have fear, *now* I become kindhearted. Is it my own, or is it the consideration of something that happened to me to which I now have formed a certain rational reaction, or in any event some form of manifestation which is really not my own but it was due to the condition of my relation with my wife.

Now if I start to question these kinds of things. Where do my thoughts come from which I because I think I'm this and this and so forth; was it because my uncle at the time told me? Where does racial questions come in; because of what I read or because of what I actually experience? All of the different opinions I may have about politics—Viet Nam; conscription, of voting; me as Man in this world, society, as a good Man wanting to live a good life, part of a community, whatever it may be. Why do I as a person keep up with the Joneses; which I do, without doubt. Why am I interested in status; because there are very few people who are not. Why do I insist on cleanliness; or the opposite, living in dirt? Why do I say it's necessary to

have a bath *every* day; and why do I want it cold: to be able to tell someone at the office that I took a cold shower. Little prides, little nonsense, it's OK at times. When I'm free from it I say, "Huh, how childish." And next time I follow the same pattern, and I love it. Because I'm not such a fool; I know very well when I am mechanical, and then I am afraid that I will uncover more mechanicality than I can stand. This is the reason I don't want to think about it. You know, it's unexplored territory in many ways, and the real sign of a real explorer is that he is constantly stimulated by that what he doesn't know as yet; and for that, like a gold prospector, he will go and hunt and hunt and hunt and suffer all kinds of things in order finally to get a little gold dust somewhere. What a Man is not willing to do in order to prove to himself that he is much more than he really is, to what particular lengths he will go to explain himself when he thinks he has been misunderstood.

Now, one can say these are tendencies and perhaps traits of character, but when they occur over and over again it is not easy to say, "Yes, that is my nature." It probably is my nature, but what is 'nature,' now. What is it that Mother Nature has given me and that I have become a slave. If that's the case, I'm sure I'm mechanical.

You see, try to think about a particular problem like that from all different kind of angles, and as I say, start with a study of the rest of the people; start with a study of the behavior of some people you know, in their biography, what they have been doing. What was the motivation of Cecil Rhodes in South Africa to discover Rhodesia? What was it in the people like Clarke and so forth who at the time ... when Bernard DeVoto writes about the discovery of the West, what made them? Not only money. I doubt it very much. Why does a person during the war wanted to join the OSS, or Secret Intelligence or the Cloak and Dagger? Not for the money. Something in them will try, maybe that other people then afterwards would recognize it, and I've said several times that when you are a grandfather you can tell your little grandchildren how wonderful you were. But I think there is also something in one at the time, that one has an ideal, and that kind of an ideal I want to strive towards, and when I accomplish it I feel good.

Much of the mechanicality is exactly because I don't want to feel no good. That's the reason. But investigate. The forty percent probably will go down to twenty and maybe ten, maybe five. *Then* there's five percent; that is, through the back door you try to save a little bit of your so-called 'memories' by saying that you have a Will, and before you're willing to admit that you are 100% mechanical—and like Ouspensky: some people are a 'machine'—not a

machine, who wants to believe it? Until I have an experience that really I cannot find anything that was original with me and that everything that I have really taken in has come from someone else.

Take originality in thought, originality in art. What is original. Einstein with the relativity theory? I think he came very close to it, but I'm afraid that he also had been stimulated by a great deal of literature published before, and he may have at a certain time be very happy to hit on certain things after enough perspiration and so forth had gone out of his ... out of his body. Surely I'm not degrading it any, but I'm not saying either that that what an inventor produces is his own. Pascal, when he wanted to learn mathematics—or really geometry—and tried to build up from a line and a point and a movement of a line and a square and a solid, all of that was still subject to certain angles. And then he came to the circle and the movement of the point around the circle became a circumference, and that's where he got stuck because he couldn't go farther with his mind, and that is mathematics for that particular mind of Pascal, he had reached a limit. Now, you can say he was original. How do I know? But maybe he did it.

A man like Wilhelm Ostwald, when he writes a book about *Naturphilosophie*, and there he is and he's honest in the beginning, he says, "I don't know where the thoughts have come from that I am writing now; all I know is that I am writing them." And that's a great honesty to make that statement, because how did he know where in his early youth he had been exposed. And this was particularly a man who was very much interested in energy. He even ... he called his villa outside of Berlin *Landhaus Energie*. It's a very interesting name, you see. Who can be as honest as that about that what he thought, that perhaps it was not his own. It's a good example of a scientist, the way a scientist should be. But many times you know well enough how they are not; or rather, how they are and how they should not be.

So, question for yourself in your life what you think is really original. Original thought, I say the building up like mathematics, or is it based on what you already know of Euclid and of the books you have read—Archimedes or who, it doesn't matter. Art, what is original. Throwing things on a canvas? Even that has no originality when the law of gravity makes the paint drop down. [laughter] You see, it happens, and if it's so important commercially, it is nonsense. You can say it's simply a matter of naming it first. But inherently what is there, what is there really that I would call 'art?' Art for the sake of expressing that what is the highest in Man, by means of which he probably would have the satisfaction that he could reach something

that otherwise he cannot reach and that maybe he creates, and maybe he creates a cathedral, maybe he creates at certain times heavenly music. Like Hoffmann. I've given example of the ninth symphony of Beethoven with the choir of the little children in there; there is something in there that is so absolutely beautiful that every person will have to admit that it's beautiful. Now if one reaches these kind of states, and a discussion between that what is subjective art and what is Objective, the criterion is that for Objective art—that is, what is real in terms of humanity as far as Earth is concerned—that each person can be and must be affected by it. It cannot leave anyone cold. It does not mean liking or disliking, but they are affected and if they become involved.

Questioner: Do you question why you are moved by it, or do you just accept it just for what it is.

Mr. Nyland: One accepts it for what it is, and you cannot help being affected when it is more Objective than something that is subjective. Subjectivity always has a limited appeal, because it happens to be the atmosphere of one or of a little group of people who imitate each other. Objectivity stands by itself; as I say, like Chartres Cathedral, like Mont Saint-Michel, like the Taj Mahal, like the Egyptian pyramids. You see, these are examples of something that was built for a definite purpose, of course, and the people who did this, perhaps they who executed it may not have been the main stays or the ones who really formulated or who reasoned it, and perhaps it may have been as a tribe doing certain things perhaps like the Mayans did, or like there are certain civilizations still noticeable in Peru.

All these kinds of things, when one becomes gradually more informed about this particular form of anthropology, that then one starts, quite amazed, in front of such products and that there are ... at that time certain things existed which we surely don't... Don't think that the Empire State Building isn't worthwhile. But, let's leave that because we get a little bit too far from one's own mechanicality; and it might become mechanical, also, and a little too much of it, to be too critical.

Now, what other things are there that we could discuss. Ah, John, don't tell me that it is almost time. Time goes much too fast. You see how death overtakes you? The death of a day. We are subject to it, to all things of that kind. If one sees it you get sometimes a little afraid because maybe you have a feeling that you have to hurry; and maybe that for a little while is very good if the hurry is expressed in a real desire and an aim which is controlled, and it is no good if it is expressed in a form of nervousness.

Bring more questions next week. Questions of life, of course; that's the only thing that concerns us; that what should be the question for your own life. That is what concerns us *par excellence*. Try to bring it. It's of benefit to someone else when it is your own. Then you contribute not only to your own welfare, but maybe for the sake of someone else who might at that time need it.

Good night, everybody.

End of tape